

## REMARKS

In the outstanding official action mailed on May 20, 2004, claims 1 through 4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and claims 1 through 20 have been rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting and under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections and submit that the claims remaining in this application define patentably over the cited reference and comply fully with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, it is respectfully submitted that method claims have always been universally construed and applied without regard to the order of the recited steps. However, in an effort to clarify the subject matter of claim 1, the recitations thereof have been rearranged without substantially altering its scope. It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 as amended above fully complies with all of the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Regarding the double patenting and anticipation rejections, it is pointed out that claim 1 is directed to a method involving the use of a reactor system that includes a plurality of reactors arranged for parallel flow. The method includes the step of dividing the feedstock into a plurality of separate feedstock streams and introducing each of said separate olefin containing feedstock streams into the reaction zone of a respective one of said reactors. A crude polyolefin product stream is removed from each of said reactors and these product streams are combined so as to form a single crude product stream. The process of Baxter, Jr. et al., as described in the cited patent (US 6,525,149) involves the use of a single reactor, a single feedstock stream and a single product stream. Even more so, Baxter, Jr. et al. do not disclose a reactor system which includes a plurality of reactors arranged for operation in parallel. In view of the foregoing, claim


1 clearly is not anticipated by Baxter, Jr. et al. It is clear also that the invention of claim 1 involving the use of such a system is not rendered obvious by the claims of the Baxter, Jr. et al. patent. Accordingly, the stated rejections of claim 1 are not supported by the record and should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 2 and 3 depend from claim 1 and are patentable over the cited reference for all of the reasons discussed above in connection with claim 1.

Claims 4 through 20 have been cancelled without prejudice to applicants' right to reassert these claims in another co-pending application.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the claims remaining for active consideration in this application define patentably over the cited reference and comply fully with all of the formal requirements of the patent statutes and rules and regulations of the Office. Accordingly, favorable action at an early date will be appreciated. If the examiner is of the view that any issue remains unresolved, it is respectfully suggested that applicants' undersigned attorney may be contacted at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James H. Marsh, Jr.

Reg. No. 24,533

STINSON MORRISON HECKER LLP

1201 Walnut Street, Suite 2800

Kansas City, MO 64106-2150

Telephone: (816) 842-8600

Facsimile: (816) 691-3495